

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office action dated January 20, 2011 has been received and carefully considered. By this amendment, claims 1, 4-6, 9, 18, 20, 21, 23, and 32 were amended, and no claims were canceled. No new claims were added. After entry of this Amendment, claims 1, and 3-34 will be pending, with claims 10-17 and 34 withdrawn. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

35 USC §102/35 USC §102

The Office maintained the prior rejection of **claims 1-9** as being anticipated by, or in the alternative obvious over Petersen (U.S. Pat. No. 5,182,013), essentially reiterating the office's earlier position with respect to the interpretation of "alpha" and "beta".

Applicant has amended the claims by specifically incorporating express elements for the "alpha" and "beta" fractions as defined in the specification on page 7, lines 3-27. In view of the amendments and comments provided in applicant's earlier response (incorporated by reference herein), the applicant believes that the rejection of claims 1-9 in view of Petersen et al. should be overcome.

35 USC §102

The Office maintained the prior rejection of **claims 18-21, and 32-33** as being anticipated by Petersen. The applicant respectfully disagrees, especially in view of the amendments herein. As amended herein, the claims now specifically incorporate express elements for the "alpha" and "beta" fractions as defined in the specification (*supra*). Therefore, and in view of the comments provided in applicant's earlier response (incorporated by reference herein), the applicant believes that the rejection of claims 18-21, and 32-33 as being anticipated by Petersen et al. should be overcome.

35 USC §103

The Office maintained the previous rejection of **claim 22** as being obvious over Petersen. Once more, the applicant respectfully disagrees for the same reasons noted above and in light of the amendments provided herein. As amended herein, claim 22 now specifically incorporates express elements for the "beta" fractions as defined in the specification (*supra*). Therefore, and in

view of the comments provided in applicant's earlier response (incorporated by reference herein), the applicant believes that the rejection of claim 22 as being obvious over Petersen et al. should be overcome.

The Office maintained the rejection of **claims 23-25** as being obvious over Kaufman (U.S. Pat. No. 1,986,775) in view of Petersen. The applicant respectfully disagrees for the same reasons noted above for claim 22. As amended herein, claims 23-25 specifically incorporate the express elements for the "beta" fractions as defined in the specification (*supra*). Therefore, the rejection of the claims as being obvious over the cited art should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter


The Office held claims **claim 26-31** as being allowable. The applicant agrees and made no changes to claims 26-31.

Request For Allowance

Claims 1 and 3-34 are pending in this application, with claims 10-17 and 34 withdrawn. The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,
Fish & Associates, PC

Date: 9/18/2011

By 
Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46697

Fish & Associates, PC
2603 Main Street, Suite 1000
Irvine, CA 92614-4271
Telephone (949) 943-8300
Fax (949) 943-8358